FAX

SENT TO : EXAMINER PAUL H. MASUR
SENT ON : Monday, February 01, 2010
Fax Number : 571 – 270 – 8297
SENT FROM : Michael A. Scaturro, Applicant's Attorney
RE : AGENDA FOR TELCON, TUES 1 PM

In the Matter of:

Application   : **10/598,299**
Applicant(s)   : **Edwin Rijpekema**
Filed   : **07/10/2008**
Confirmation   : **2549**
T.C./Art Unit   : **2416**
Examiner   : **Paul H. Masur**
Atty. Docket   : **NL040209 [MS-351]**
Title: **DATA PROCESSING CIRCUIT WHEREIN DATA PROCESSING UNITS COMMUNICATE VIA A NETWORK**

Dear Examiner Masur:

As I mentioned in our conversation earlier today. I would like to discuss the rejection of claim 1 made in the Office Action, mail date 12/07/09. In particular, I would like to discuss why claim 1 should be allowable over the cited reference, Radulescu. I would also like to discuss your suggestion of doing a 131 or a 132 Affidavit.

Page **1** of **4**

1. A data processing circuit contained on an integrated circuit, comprising:

a network (12) contained on the integrated circuit, that is operable in successive time-slots;

a plurality of data processing units (10) contained on the integrated circuit, interconnected by the network (12), and arranged to send streams of messages concurrently through the network (12), each stream comprising messages that occupy shareable resources (20) in the network (12) in a periodically repeating selection of successive time-slots, a period of repetition (P) being the same for all the streams;

node circuits (22) in the network (12), the node circuits (22) being arranged to forward the messages along multi-node paths through the network (12), each particular stream being assigned a respective stream specific path along which the node circuits (22) forward all messages of the particular stream, **the node circuits (22) being arranged to decide whether to forward or discard each message dependent on a measure of seniority of the message in its particular stream,** each particular node circuit (22) being arranged to prevent forwarding of a more junior message in the particular stream for which insufficient resources (20) are left because of forwarding of a more senior message from another stream from the particular node circuit (22).

Reasons why I believe Claim 1 is allowable over Radulescu:

- ## **FIRST POINT OF DISCUSSION**

- I believe that Radilescu does not teach the following portion of Claim 1:

- ....**node circuits (22) in the network (12), the node circuits (22) being arranged to forward the messages along multi-node paths through the network (12), each particular stream being assigned a respective stream specific path along which the node circuits (22) forward all messages of the particular stream**

- The Office cites par. 61 of Radilescu for teaching this feature, however, a guaranteed-throughput read connection, reserving slots is different from assigning a respective

stream path. Guaranteed throughput ensures that the average rate of successful message delivery will be above a threshold value. It does not directly address assigning a specific stream path.

- From Wikipedia - - - - In communication networks, such as Ethernet or packet radio, **throughput** or **network throughput** is the average rate of successful message delivery over a communication channel. This data may be delivered over a physical or logical link, or pass through a certain network node. The throughput is usually measured in bits per second (bit/s or bps), and sometimes in data packets per second or data packets per time slot.

- Par. 61 of Radilescu - - - - - [0061] An example for the use of differential properties for the outgoing and return parts is described as follows. Guaranteed-throughput connections can overbook resources in some cases. For example, when an ANIP opens a guaranteed-throughput read connection, it must reserve slots for the read command messages, and for the read data messages. The ratio between the two can be very large (e.g., 1:100), which leads either to a large number of slots, or bandwidth being wasted for the read command messages.

- ## SECOND POINT OF DISCUSSION

- I believe that Radilescu does not teach the following portion of Claim 1:

- **.......the node circuits (22) being arranged to decide whether to forward or discard each message dependent on a measure of seniority of the message in its particular stream, as recited in claim 1**

- **There is no teaching at par. 62 that discloses – node circuits deciding whether to forward or discard each message on a measure of seniority of message in its particular stream.**

- **The Office cites par. 62** of Radilescu - - - - - [0062] To solve this problem, the connection properties of the request and response parts of a connection can be configured independently for all of throughput, latency and jitter. Consequently, the connection properties of request part of a connection can be best effort, while the connection properties of response can have guaranteed throughput (or vice versa). For the example mentioned above, we can use best effort read messages, and guaranteed-throughput read-data messages. No global connection guarantees can be offered in this case, but the

overall throughput can be higher and more stable than in the case of using only best-effort traffic.

Looking forward to speaking with you tomorrow.

Kind Regards,

Michael Scaturro
Outside Counsel
Philips Corporation
Garden City, NY
Tel. No. : (516) 414 2007